

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art in view of Ohta et al. (US 5,673,128).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claim 4 to better define the invention. Applicants submit herewith a Submission of Formal Drawings and a Request for Approval of Drawing Changes.

**Correction of Drawings**

Applicants request approval of the proposed drawing change shown in red in the attached copies of FIG. 3, provided with a Request for Approval of Drawing Changes. Applicants propose changes of the informality, as shown in the attached Request for Approval of Drawing Changes. Applicants also respectfully request approval of the Submission of New Drawings submitted concurrently herewith.

**Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art in view of Ohta et al. (US 5,673,128). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claim 4 recites in part "light emitted from one of the plurality of linear light sources is shielded by the light shielding plate and transmitted through only the light diffusion plate to irradiate a second portion of the liquid crystal panel from the rear side thereof with a second luminance higher than the first luminance." In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, the light shield pattern 17 taught by Ohta et al. *reduces* the luminance of light transmitted

substantially parallel with a normal line of the light guide plate from the light source.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ohta et al. neither teaches nor suggests the Applicants' claimed features of a first portion of a liquid crystal panel irradiated with a first uniform luminance, and a second portion of the liquid crystal panel with a second luminance higher than the first luminance. These claimed features are also completely lacking from the admitted prior art shown in FIG. 5.

Furthermore, Ohta et al. discloses that the light shielding pattern 17 is formed on the counter face of the extended portion 15d of the light guide plate 15 for preventing the face luminance in the vicinity of the linear light source from becoming extremely higher than the other portions. This arrangement is designed based on the concept of the reduction of the face luminance in the vicinity of the linear light source for providing constant face luminance. In contrast, the claimed invention requires a second luminance at a second portion of the liquid crystal panel to be higher than a first luminance at a first portion of the liquid crystal panel. Thus, the concept of the present invention is opposite to that of Ohta et al. Therefore, the arrangement of Ohta et al. teaches away from the claimed invention.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applies references, whether taken alone or in combination.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE.**"

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: June 4, 2003

**Customer No. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-739-3000

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

Claim 4 has been amended as follows:

4. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device including an under light type back light unit in which light emitted from a plurality of linear light sources is reflected by a reflecting sheet disposed at a rear side of the plurality of linear light sources, then transmitted through a light modulation film and a light diffusion plate to form a planar light source with a **first** uniform luminance [~~thereby to~~] indirectly [~~irradiate~~] **irradiating** **a first portion of** a liquid crystal panel from a rear side thereof,

wherein one end portion of the light modulation film is shielded by a light shielding plate, and light emitted from one of the plurality of linear light sources is shielded by the light shielding plate and transmitted through only the light diffusion plate [~~thereby~~] to [~~directly~~] irradiate [~~with a higher luminance on a part of a display area~~] **a second portion** of the liquid crystal panel [~~than that of another part of the display area~~] **from the rear side thereof with a second luminance higher than the first luminance.**